

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 131-286 remain in this application. Claims 131, 135, 144, 148, 157, 161, 170, 174, 183, 187, 196, 200, 209, 213, 222, 226, 235, 239, 243, 246, 248, 252, 256, 258, 259, 261, 265, 269, 271, 272, 274, 278, 282, 284, and 285 have been amended.

II. INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Applicant has resubmitted the information disclosure statements that the Office Action cited.

III. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 131-136, 139-149, 152-162, 165-175, 178-188, 191-201, 204-214, 217-227, 230-240, 243-253, 256-266, 269-279 and 282-286 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura et al. (US 5,719,982), Wagner (US 5,600,379) and Takagi et al. (US Patent 5,999,691). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 131 appears as follows:

131. A method for storage and display of multimedia data, comprising the steps of:
- concurrently receiving at least two digital television streams;
  - extracting from the at least two digital television streams, MPEG streams that contain a plurality of video frames and time stamps associated with the video frames;
  - identifying starting locations of video frames within the MPEG streams and time stamps associated with video frames;
  - concurrently storing on a storage device the MPEG streams, starting locations of video frames within the MPEG streams and time stamps associated with the video frames, the storage device additionally containing a plurality of previously stored MPEG

streams, starting locations of video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams and time stamps associated with the video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams;  
accepting a user control command;  
in response to the user control command, selecting a particular video frame from within a particular MPEG stream stored on the storage device using a time stamp stored on the storage device associated with the selected particular video frame essentially simultaneously with the concurrent storage on the storage device of the MPEG streams;  
retrieving the selected particular video frame using a stored starting location of the selected particular video frame; and  
sending the selected particular video frame for display.

The Office Action states “... it is noted that the device disclosed by Kawamura can be used to repeat the recoding process of many MPEG streams and their associated information as described in (2) and (3) into the recording medium. ... In other words, Kawamura clearly discloses ‘the storage device additionally containing a plurality of previously stored MPEG streams, starting locations of video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams and time stamps associated with the video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams.’” and “In response, the Examiner respectfully submits that even though Kawamura does not explicitly state that his or her device can be used to record different MPEG streams to the recording medium at different points of time, but one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize Kawamura does not teach a device that is used to record only one specific stream then disposed.” Once more, Applicant states that there is no support of such a statement in Kawamura.

Kawamura clearly states that his invention is a **decoder**. Col. 10, lines 11-14 state:

“Therefore, an object of the present invention is to provide data decoding apparatus for obtaining intermittent time codes, displaying the time codes for individual frames, and searching programs corresponding to the time codes.”

This statement directly conflicts with the Final Office Action's statement "the Examiner respectfully submits that even though Kawamura does not explicitly state that his or her device can be used to record different MPEG streams to the recording medium at different points of time, but one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize Kawamura does not teach a device that is used to record only one specific stream then disposed" because Kawamura's invention is a **decoder** and is **not** used to record.

Given that Kawamura's invention is a decoder that reads information from his DSM, Kawamura's decoder performs its interpolation of time codes **after** the program has been recorded onto the DSM. The Office Action's logic is flawed because it places Kawamura's decoder in the wrong location, i.e., the Office Action seems to be saying that Kawamura's decoder is outputting to the DSM at the time of the recording of the program. This is illogical because Kawamura specifically states that his decoder reads from the DSM and then outputs video and audio signals via the video decoder 25 and audio decoder 26 (Fig. 16).

The Office Action points to col. 11, lines 40-67 as disclosing **identifying** starting locations of video frames within the MPEG streams and time stamps associated with video frames and **concurrently storing** on a storage device the MPEG streams, starting locations of video frames within the MPEG streams and time stamps associated with the video frames, the storage device additionally containing a plurality of previously stored MPEG streams, starting locations of video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams and time stamps associated with the video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams. However, col. 11, lines 40-67 and Fig 16 clearly show that Kawamura's decoder does not record on the DSM 10, but rather reads from the DSM and outputs the video and audio signals to the user. Col. 11, lines 40-67 state:

“One feature of the present invention is the time code interpolating circuit 42 that interpolates time codes that are intermittently supplied thereto so as to generate successive time codes. The header separating circuit 22 separates a time code (TC) from a GOP header and supplies the separated time code to the time code interpolating circuit 42 which outputs the time code (TC) for a picture at the beginning of the GOP. For a picture not at the beginning of GOP, the time code interpolating circuit 42 outputs an incremented value (in the normal reproduction mode) or a decremented value (in the reverse reproduction mode) as an interpolated time code, thereby generating time codes for every picture in the GOP.

FIG. 17 shows the relation between the pictures in a GOP and the time codes in accordance with the present invention. For the first picture  $I_0$  of a particular GOP, the time code (0h01m02s01f) that has been designated in the encoding process is obtained from the GOP header (where h represents hour, m represents minute, s represents second, and f represents frame). The next picture  $B_0$  was not assigned a time code by the encoding process. Thus, the time code interpolating circuit 42 generates the interpolated time code (0h01m02s02f) for the picture  $B_0$ . In the same manner, the time code interpolating circuit 42 successively generates interpolated time codes for the remaining pictures belonging to the same GOP as picture  $I_0$ . Consequently, the time code interpolating circuit 42 eventually generates the time code (0h01m02s16f) which, it is appreciated, happens to be assigned to the picture  $I_1$ ; and this same time code is read from the GOP header because  $I_1$  is the first picture of the next GOP.”

It is not physically possible, according to Kawamura, to do what the Office Action posits.

Further, Kawamura does not teach or disclose in response to the user control command, selecting a particular video frame from within a particular MPEG stream stored on the storage device using a time stamp stored on the storage device associated with the selected particular video frame essentially simultaneously with the concurrent storage on the storage device of the MPEG streams as cited in Claim 131. Kawamura performs his operations after the program has been stored on the DSM. The Office Action points to col. 13, lines 1-18, however, col. 13, lines 1-10 disclose the use of time code differences that are interpolated by the decoder and are not stored on the DSM.

Additionally, col. 13, lines 11-18 disclose a TOC table that is only completed after the program has been recorded onto the DSM. The TOC is completed after the locations of the entry points on the disc have been calculated and stored. Kawamura cannot perform in response to the user control command, selecting a particular video frame from within a particular MPEG stream stored on the storage device using a time stamp stored on the storage device associated with the selected particular video frame **essentially simultaneously** with the concurrent storage on the storage device of the MPEG streams because the TOC is read after the program has been entirely recorded and the TOC represents the entire contents of the disc, i.e., there is only one TOC on a disc.

Therefore, Kawamura does not teach or disclose extracting from the at least two digital television streams MPEG streams that contain a plurality of video frames and time stamps associated with the video frames, identifying starting locations of video frames within the MPEG streams and time stamps associated with video frames, and concurrently storing on a storage device the MPEG streams, starting locations of video frames within the MPEG streams and time stamps associated with the video frames, the storage device additionally containing a plurality of previously stored MPEG streams, starting locations of video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams and time stamps associated with the video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams as cited in Claim 131. Therefore, Kawamura does not teach or disclose what is cited in Claim 131.

Therefore, Kawamura in view of Wagner and Takagi does not teach or disclose the invention as claimed.

Claim 131 is allowable. Independent Claims 144, 183, 196, 235, and 248 are similarly allowable. Claims 132-136, 139-141, 143, and 145-149, 152-154, 156, and

184-188, 191-193, 195, and 197-201, 204-206, 208, and 236-240, 243-245, 247, and 249-253, 256-258, 260 are dependent upon Claims 131, 144, 183, 196, 235, and 248, respectively, and are allowable.

With respect to Claim 141, Kawamura makes no mention of such features cited in Claim 141. Col. 12, line 66 to col. 13, line 10 do not disclose such features. The Final Office Action also states in the Response to Arguments section, page 3:

“The destination can be determined by users. Depending on which monitor or TV set is plugged in, the destination is different.”

The Final Office Action’s comment is illogical. The Final Office Action seems to be saying that a user may physically disconnect and connect a different monitor or TV set in order to make the destinations different. However, the claim states “sending the selected particular video frame and the selected second particular video frame to different destinations for display”. Given the Final Office Action’s logic, a user would have to physically switch between at least two monitors or TV sets fast enough to have the selected particular video frame appear on one monitor and the selected second particular video frame to appear on a different monitor. This shows that the Final Office Action’s statement is illogical.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

#### IV. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 137, 150, 163, 176, 189, 202, 215, 228, 241, 254, 259, 267, and 280 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura et al. (US 5,719,982), Wagner (US 5,600,379) and Takagi et al. (US 5,999,691) as applied to claims 131-136, 139-149, 152-162, 165-175, 178-188, 191-201,

204-214, 217-227, 230-240, 243-253, 256-266, 269-279 and 282- 286 above, and in further view of Logan et al. (Re. 36,801). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is deemed moot in view of Applicant's comments regarding Claims 131, 144, 157, 170, 183, 196, 209, 222, 235, 248, 261, and 274, above. Claims 137, 142, and 150, 155, and 163, 168, and 176, 181, and 189, 194, and 202, 207, and 215, 220, and 228, 233, and 241, 246, and 254, 259, and 267, 272, and 280, 285 are dependent upon Claims 131, 144, 157, 170, 183, 196, 209, 222, 235, 248, 261, and 274, respectively, and are allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

#### V. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 138, 151, 164, 177, 190, 203, 216, 229, 242, 255, 268, and 281 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura et al. (US 5,719,982), Wagner (US 5,600,379) and Takagi et al. (US 5,999,691) as applied to claims 131-136, 139-149, 152-162, 165-175, 178-188, 191-201, 204-214, 217-227, 230-240, 243-253, 256-266, 269-279 and 282-286 above, and in further view of Yuen et al. (US 5,488,409). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is deemed moot in view of Applicant's comments regarding Claims 131, 144, 157, 170, 183, 196, 209, 222, 235, 248, 261, and 274, above. Claims 138, and 151, and 164, and 177, and 190, and 203, and 216, and 229, and 242, and 255, and 268, and 281 are dependent upon Claims 131, 144, 157, 170, 183, 196, 209, 222, 235, 248, 261, and 274, respectively, and are allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

VI. MISCELLANEOUS

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

The Applicants believe that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed and that allowance of the pending claims is appropriate. Entry of the amendments herein and further examination on the merits are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (408) 414-1080 ext. 214 to discuss any issue that may advance prosecution.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee that may be due in connection with this Reply to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: July 11, 2008

/KirkDWong#43284/

Kirk D. Wong  
Reg. No. 43,284

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, California 95110-1089  
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 214  
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076